

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/713,494	11/14/2003	Paulette J. Miller	LIT.01	9184	
25871	7590 03/03/2005		EXAMINER		
SWANSON & BRATSCHUN L.L.C.			FETSUGA, I	FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
SUITE 330	1745 SHEA CENTER DRIVE SUITE 330		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
HIGHLAND	S RANCH, CO 80129		3751	-	
			DATE MAILED: 03/03/2009	DATE MAILED: 03/03/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/713,494	MILLER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert M. Fetsuga	3751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONEC	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 No	ovember 2003.					
☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or e						
Application Papers	•					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	;					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	·					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dai 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, 19 and 20, drawn to a bathing apparatus, classified in class 4, subclass 572.1.
- II. Claims 12-18, drawn to a method of manufacturing a bathing apparatus, classified in class 4, subclass 661.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a process not requiring providing elements.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification which would lead to divergent fields of search, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Application/Control Number: 10/713,494

Art Unit: 3751

Species I: Fig. 1;

Species II: Fig. 3;

Species III: Fig. 4; and

Species IV: Fig. 5.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, at least claims 1 and 19 are considered to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP \$ 809.02(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/713,494

order, deliterar manager, re, vre, re

Art Unit: 3751

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. Upon an election of a species as defined above, a further election of one of the following sub-species is required consonant with the rules set forth supra:

Sub-species A: Fig. 1 (element 3, claim 10); and Sub-species B: Par. 17, line 10 (claim 10).

- 4. A telephone call was made to James L. Brown on February 28, 2005 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 571/272-4886 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday.

Robert M. Fetsuga Primary Examiner Page 4

Art Unit 3751